

Christianity and Crisis

A Bi-Weekly Journal of Christian Opinion

VOL. XI, No. 2

FEBRUARY 19, 1951

\$2.00 per year; 10 cents per copy

On Tolerance, Liberty and Conviction

REVIEWING in a recent number of *The Harvard Law Review* Dr. Stokes' great work on *Church and State in the United States* Prof. Mark Howe, while fully recognizing the importance of the author's achievement, a "work of unparalleled utility," expresses the belief that Dr. Stokes has failed to grapple with some of the problems which lie "under the surface of recorded fact and opinion." Among these Prof. Howe notes the ever present tension between Church and State, the meaning of liberty and the ground for the acceptance as a principle of action and suggests finally that "the heart of our constitutional problem will be reached only when scholars, statesmen and churchmen ask themselves whether the objective of freedom and separation is not so intimately related to an article of religious faith as to make the state a religious partisan when it seeks to attain that objective."

This brief paper does not deal with that final question directly nor attempts to weigh the respective merits of the reviewer and reviewed. It is concerned only with one of the questions raised: on what ground can convinced believers tolerate dissent or accept the principle of liberty? The question is highlighted today by the increasing tension in America between Catholicism and Protestantism, and outside the religious field by the menacing growth of intolerance towards failure to conform to dominant (or professedly dominant) opinion in political and civic matters. A recent Jesuit statement emphasized the former as does the activity of Protestants and Other Americans United. McCarthyism is the extreme form of the latter.

The question is, however, directly raised by Dr. Stokes himself in his statement that religious liberty represents "an inherent element among the rights of man as endowed by his Maker." Many believers in our constitutional provisions would question that opinion, and although Dr. Stokes discusses the Roman Catholic position at considerable length, Prof. Howe seems right in asserting that he has failed to realize that that church's position denies it. The ac-

ceptance of it in America is a matter of expediency for Catholics and Prof. Howe inclines to think that expediency or practical scepticism is the ground upon which most Americans would support any policy of religious liberty and the tolerance which that requires.

But is that true? Unquestionably there are many Americans who never think beyond expediency in such a matter; but there are plenty of others—Protestants whose convictions are as strong as those of any Roman Catholic and citizens who yield nothing in loyalty to Senator McCarthy. It is an old debate which this opens but the position of these convinced believers rests always upon the same ultimate ground, whether one looks to the New Testament or to Plato, or comes down to Milton and Jeremy Taylor, and on to today. It is first the obvious and simple fact that in this matter we are dealing with an area of human life which transcends the compulsion of law. Ideas and the faiths which make them effective, that is to give them motive power, may be molded by education and environment but they cannot be compelled. Society can successfully command action. It cannot command belief. A regimented society like that of Soviet Russia or Catholic Spain may be molded into a relative uniformity of belief, but "the Spirit breatheth where it listeth."

It is again because men are children of God and the ultimate resources of life are in God, and men's relationship with God is therefore primarily personal, that they can achieve their destiny only in freedom. All of which is presumably but another way of putting Dr. Stokes' view of man's elemental rights. If truth means the world as God sees it (we venture the definition) then it is that into which human life must ultimately fit. Truth must prevail if man continues to struggle freely. Persuasion, as Plato would have it, is the tool of truth. The leap of faith to that which reaches the depths and heights of human need is the response which religion seeks.

The implication for our religious and social faiths is obvious. In religion our tolerance or our grant of liberty of worship to all faiths is not a necessary evi-

dence of scepticism or of indifference. It is a normal and valid expression of profound conviction concerning the truth of the faith (whatever it is) which we profess. If we who are Christians seek to *compel* belief, we are not only violating the spirit of our own faith, we are certainly failing to fit into the way God works. Repression is an evidence not of faith but of doubt; compulsion, intolerance, denial of liberty are proclamations of insecurity in our own inner life.

That is true for nations as well as for people. In a society which claims to be free, the recourse to repression and compulsion is the denial of its claim. If New York school children cannot read *The Nation*, and the reporter for *The Daily Worker* is excluded from a state legislature, our faith in freedom has for a time capitulated. Insecurity and doubt are dominant.

It is true likewise of the church. If a church re-

fuses conference, withdraws steadily from contact with other religious groups and regards freedom of worship as essentially wrong, it is not evidence of faith but of doubt, not the witness to a conquering truth but to a hidden sense of insecurity. It is not the way God works. He certainly punishes sin. He certainly makes it clear that ignorance and stupidity take their toll in human society, but there is no evidence that the fruits of the Spirit can be won by police methods or that the Kingdom of God can be enacted by legislation. Freedom to educate; freedom to speak; freedom to test truth in God's world of struggling, groping, longing humanity—that kind of freedom is not the expression of doubt, nor of political or ecclesiastical expediency, but of a faith confident that where such freedom exists truth will prevail.—EDWARD L. PARSONS

The Christian Church in the Near East

LOOFTY LEVONIAN

THE problem of the Christian church in the Near East is primarily that of its relationship with Islam. It is very sad that the attitudes between these two groups have been unfriendly and antagonistic in the past—the Muslims regarding the Christian church as an unwanted foster child only to be “tolerated,” and the Christians looking for the day when Islam shall be stripped of its power and be subjugated. As a consequence of this mutually antagonistic attitude, the Christian church has been on the losing end during the past thirteen centuries, so that today in cities like Smyrna, Tarsus, and Antioch, once the strongholds of Christianity, not one single Christian church has been left.

It is unfortunate that this question of the relationship between Islam and Christianity, so vital for the life of the church, has not been a matter of serious consideration by the Christians themselves. The churches have followed the easy but dangerous path of *laissez faire*, acting always according to the exigencies of immediate events, without considering its future consequences. We have erected grand church buildings with steeples rising in the sky, without taking into account the feelings of the Muslims around us. We have clamored for our community rights in the administration of the country, and have made ourselves rivals with our neighbors. We have thought of the welfare of our own peoples, educated our children, treated our sick and helped our poor, but neglected the needy ones around us. Such attitudes have widened the already existing gap between the two

communities, causing envy, anger, hatred, and occasional persecutions.

To counterbalance this, the church has resorted to the protection of foreign Powers, and this has made the unhappy situation still more complicated. These lands have been for many centuries a battleground between the Powers from the East reaching out toward the West, and the Powers from the West pushing on the opposite side, and the church in the middle has almost always taken sides with the West. Without considering their political ambitions, the church has knocked at the doors of politicians for help and protection, and has been terribly disappointed. That has been one of the main causes of the sufferings of the church in the past ages. Instead of turning our eyes outside, we should have come to terms with our neighbors.

There are signs of a better policy, however, on both sides at the present time to promote fellowship and cooperation with one another. In many schools, primary and higher, Muslim and Christian boys and girls are studying together under the direction of Muslim and Christian teachers. In many hospitals, Muslim and Christian physicians and nurses are working together serving the patients of both communities. In business, Christian and Muslim partnership is growing with confidence on both sides. In literature, Muslims and Christians are writing in the same papers, and occasionally publishing a book as co-authors. Military service is obligatory for all. Muslim and Christian soldiers are sharing the same

food, sleeping under the same tent, and receiving the same training under one command. In such ways, big and small, contact and fellowship is growing, opening the way for a better understanding between the two sections of the community. These are all hopeful signs and worthy of every encouragement, but they do not seem to be enough to uproot the age-long feeling of antagonism and change it into fellowship and reconciliation. Something more radical is needed. What can the Christian church do? is the urgent question at the present time.

Perhaps we can learn from the experience of the early Christians. The churches of the Apostles were confronted with the same kind of problem. Group conflicts characterized the Roman world. Greeks and Jews, slaves and free citizens, lived in antagonistic camps, and their mutual relationship was a serious question for the church. St. Paul, facing the questions squarely, finds the solution not in one group's domination of the other, but in bringing both sides to a new mind, the mind of Christ. He says, "If any man be in Christ, he is a new creature . . ." and calls both sides to "repentance," that is, to a change of mind. While a Jew remained a Jew and a Greek a Greek, they could not join hands, but if they both could have a new mind, the mind of Christ, they could be reconciled. St. Paul, speaking of this from his own experience, tells how he, himself a Pharisee, zealous for his nation and religion, became a minister to the Gentiles, and could therefore say, "Jew or Greek . . . you are all one in Christ Jesus."

Exactly the same principle is necessary in the present situation. Both the Christian and the Muslim must have a change of mind, a "repentance," and be fashioned in the image of Jesus Christ. This may seem commonplace, but its actual meaning in the present situation in the Near East should be understood by the church.

Organization

The present national and semi-political organization of the Christian church must be changed. The Christian churches in the Muslim lands have a peculiar status as "millets," recognized by the civil authority and registered as such in the official registry. To be a Christian means to be known as a member of one of those national and semi-political organizations, and a change of religious affiliation means also a change of one's civic status. All the old national churches have this organization, and the new Evangelical Christian Church also has accepted that same status and been organized accordingly. Thus by becoming a Christian, one does not merely join the Spiritual Body of Christ, but a national body, a thing that is altogether contrary to the nature of the Christian church. We speak of the lack of religious liberty in Muslim lands, and forget that such liberties as changing one's religion and communicating

one's beliefs to others, namely evangelism, is against the very organization of the Christian church, and is not desired by the church itself. This is very important for the growth of the church and a change should be made.

Dogmatic Teaching

Second, it will mean a change in the dogmatic and ethical teaching of the church. If organization was the sin of the old National Churches, then dogmatic teaching is the sin of the Protestant Churches. Protestantism in those lands has been recognized primarily as a movement of protest against the non-Biblical dogmas of the ancient churches. It has fallen short in the positive emphasis of calling men to the new life in Christ, and witnessing to it in practical relationships. To become a Protestant it was necessary to deny the superstitious beliefs in the church, and to accept the correct doctrines of the Christian faith. But Christianity is more than dogma: it is a new life in Christ, calling men to a new attitude in their relationship with their neighbors. Jesus said, "Love your enemies." It is not enough to love God; we must love our neighbors also. It is not enough to pray God for the forgiveness of our sins; we must be ready also to forgive those who have sinned against us. Love begets love; hatred breeds hatred. A man reaps whatsoever he sows. I am speaking from personal experience. I have seen courtesy and kindness turn wild men into lambs. That should be the task of the Christian church in the Near East at the present time. These churches have been persecuted and wounded, and yet they are called upon to heal their persecutors with the balsam of love. The churches in the Near East have one privilege—they can forgive their enemies and pray for them, and until the churches do this, there can be no peace in the Near East.

But, you will say, is this ever possible? This is the challenge to the Christian community, and if Christianity cannot do this, it is superficial and useless for the present time.

We are passing through critical times. Our most urgent need is for reconciliation, and the Christian church is called to show the right way for it.

In the past, the Greek and Armenian Churches in Turkey, and the Arab Christian Churches in Syria and Palestine have lost great opportunities for reconciliation. Instead of becoming partisans in the conflict, supporting one side against the other, we should have been mediators for reconciliation, inviting all to a new mind—the mind in Christ Jesus. We have failed to do this, and we, ourselves, have also suffered for it. The day of National Christianity is past; it savors of national superiority and domination. The day of Sectarian Christianity is also past; it savors of religious superiority and domination. What we need is the spirit of *koinonia*, a spiritual

fellowship, where men meet men as friends in spirit. To achieve this the church must be willing to become less of a national and sectarian group, and more of a spiritual group.

National and dogmatic disputes have separated us from one another. We all need a change of mind—a new mind that will remove the obstacles that divide us, and lead us to seek fellowship with our neighbors, so that we shall all follow “the more excellent way” and be one in Christ Jesus.

How Christians Face the World

HUGH STEVENSON TIGNER

THIS present period of history has been described by all sorts of names, and one of the most telling of them is given by the British-American poet, W. H. Auden, who has called it the “Age of Anxiety.” That is probably not the label historians will be pasting on our time a century or two hence, but that expresses a good deal of how it feels to be alive in it. There is a vast popular swell in the Western World of consternation, panic and dread.

It is my purpose and pleasure to point out that these things—I mean the consternation, the panic and the dread—are not Christian. Only a quick dip into The New Testament (e.g. Luke 12:22-32; Acts 14:21) shows there is something in the Christian faith that overcomes the world, and is not dismayed when history brings forth terrible things.

One reason why there is so much consternation and disappointment over the way things have shaped up in our time is that modern men came to have a romantic optimism toward the world and history. They assumed that things were, by the regular process of nature, getting better and better, and would continue racing down that congenial groove until mortal life would become a wonderful romping around in abundances, securities and pleasures.

This modern romantic optimism was justified by three doctrines. First, that human nature is essentially reasonable and good. Secondly, that all we have to do is give the reasonable and good in human nature a decent chance to show itself—and what was meant by a decent chance was: give people favorable material conditions, and send them through the public school system. Thirdly, it was presumed that modern man had acquired (or would soon acquire) the tools and knowledge for accomplishing this happy transformation.

This modern faith in man, the world and history was three or four centuries in developing and impressing itself upon the popular consciousness. But it gradually put into men's thoughts, feelings and habits a view of life, and a response to life, that was

a far departure from Christianity, without brazenly appearing to be so. But for one thing, this modern view—and it was actually modern only in date and wrapping—prompted men to think of their life as primarily, mainly and most importantly an affair of this world. The main problem was to get through this span of existence with physiological, material and social success, have a lot of fun, reach a good age, and die with one's boots on. That came to be considered the maximum achievement—at least all the achievement one could be sure of.

Now, this was also the outlook of the ancient pagans, and in those days it was frankly appraised as a rather dreary one. Paul reminded the Christians at Ephesus to remember that in former days they had been “strangers to the covenants of promise, having no hope and without God in the world” (Ephesians 2:12). The ancient pagan—eating, drinking and trying to be merry in a hard, fortuitous and short existence—had (and tended to recognize that he had) a bleak prospect. He was without a great hope, his life had no transcendent meaning, and he knew nothing of the love and mercy of God. But the modern epoch was able to pump a good deal of cheer into this view of life, because, with modern equipment, living could be made increasingly more comfortable, delightful and safe, and could be stretched out much longer. Poverty, pain, disease, disaster, hardship, oppression, cruelty, war and death could be pushed further back—perhaps entirely off the map.

This was the good news of the modern gospel. This was what the prophets of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries declared. This was what modern peoples, by and large, came to hug to their hearts for faith and hope. This was the picture that Tom, Dick and Harry, Mary, Jane and Dorothy came to consider their heritage, their prospect and their due. But the covenant of that promise has been broken; and people have been plunged into a pit of gloom from which the only creative rescue can be a rediscovery of the Christian gospel.

The modern view of life was confused by many with the Christian. This was possible because some modern views paralleled the Christian gospel some of the way.

Take the modern doctrine that human nature is essentially reasonable and good. This parallels the Christian understanding of man as bearing the “image of God” in his nature. That is to say, man has an affinity with God that makes him able to know, receive and respond to God. God, in his love, calls all men to himself, and has endowed all men with an ear capable of hearing that call. But there is no blanket assurance in the Christian gospel that men will listen. Indeed, there is the strongest suggestion that many will not. In the parable of the sower, for example, it is only a fraction of the seed

that falls on fruitful ground. And there are explicit statements, such as: "the gate is narrow and the way is hard, that leads to life, and those who find it are few" (Matthew 7:14); "the light has come into the world, and men loved darkness rather than light" (John 3:19).

The modern gospel gives its assurance regarding man, saying that we can depend upon his innate goodness. The Christian gospel gives its assurance regarding God, saying that we can depend upon *His* goodness.

Consider the second point of the modern gospel—namely, give people what they need to develop the fullness of life: give them the material necessities, give them education, give them freedom, give them opportunities. The modern name for this is "justice," the idea being that everyone born into this world is entitled to a full and fair chance. There is no conflict here with the Christian gospel. As a matter of fact—and this is a very important fact—this modern concept of justice derived from the Christian gospel and experience, and it developed only in those lands where there was a soil of Christian faith to nourish it. It developed not only from the Christian doctrine that love is the proper rule of living and brotherliness the right relation among persons, but also from knowing or experiencing the Christian gospel's announcement of a new creation (a new person and a new community).

The debt of the modern gospel to the Christian gospel with regard to the idea and ideal of social justice is not widely recognized or fully appreciated in the modern world. For the modern gospel is proud of itself and claims self-sufficiency. It likes to think of its concept of social justice as having sprung from human reason. But this concept was not born of pure reason. Insofar as reason explains it, it developed through reasoning from premises supplied by the Christian faith. And here is where the modern gospel and the Christian gospel, having met and appeared to fuse at one point, spring back from each other and part company completely.

The modern gospel presumed that it could get along in its project of achieving social justice without the Christian faith. It reasoned thus: give more people better conditions of living, and they will become more reasonable and virtuous persons; then, as we get more persons who are more reasonable and better, they will work to make conditions still better, and will extend those better conditions to more people; until, finally, the job is finished and you've got something like paradise on earth.

The Christian gospel is not that naive. For one thing, it has a different notion of what constitutes giving people a fair, decent and proper chance. Better material and social conditions alone are not enough, for there is a grip of evil on man's life which is spiritual as well as material. This grip must be broken, and it must be broken spiritually as

well as materially. Men must have bread, but they must also have the Bread of Life (a new life, a new spirit). A decent and proper chance means offering them also the Christian gospel, the Christian message, the Christian faith: it means calling people to the obedience of Christ. And the Christian worldview recognizes quite clearly that where people do not hear and answer this call they are still walking in darkness and living under the dominion of darkness.

History has surely justified this latter proposition. It has shown that the world, taken as a whole, is verily under the dominion of darkness; it has demonstrated that men, under their own steam and guidance, are incapable of doing those reasonable, beautiful, redemptive things that moderns have hoped for and expected. When men do not offer their lives humbly and trustfully to obedience of the God revealed in Jesus Christ, the justice they achieve turns out to be a cruel tyranny, their efforts to establish righteousness require, at last, the liquidation of all who hold a different opinion. History proves the confidence in man to be an illusion. But Christianity never had that illusion.

The New Testament nowhere buttresses any confidence in man by himself. The confidence with which the New Testament brims over is confidence in what God can (and will) do when men give him their faithfulness. And it has nothing but the most pessimistic expectation of what the people who refuse to make this offering will do, of what they will bring down upon everyone, including Christians.

Christians are not routed by the hardships and horrors of the world, because they do not see the world as either the first or the last thing, but as something in the middle. Our destiny is determined by the way in which we respond during this mortal passage, but our destiny is not necessarily wrapped up in the world. There is something deeper and higher than human history in which we are permitted to participate—and that is God, in whom our confidence and hope are placed. The Christian point of view (faith) is that in this mortal world we have been offered a chance, not to have fun, but to live forever, to find the life that is life indeed, to enter into fellowship with the almighty and eternal God.

This Christian outlook has been called by moderns "otherworldly," and that is supposed to be a very bad thing. It is supposed to make people indifferent, irresponsible, complacent toward conditions in the world. It is said to make people unconcerned about the welfare of their fellows. There is, in short, a heavy barrage of slanders of this kind. And they are all slanders, either the slanders of ignorance or the slanders of malice.

The truth is that the Christian view is the one that makes our life here and now really important,

because the infinite issue of eternal life is understood to be pressing down upon it and mixing in it. The Christian is everywhere called upon to be concerned and to be responsible and to spend himself in good works, because he is required everywhere to live with faithfulness to God. He does not flatter his fellowmen after the manner of the modern gospel, but he sees them far more significantly and with a greater sense of duty: he sees them as candidates for eternal life, and is called upon to be an ambassador of Christ in their behalf. And speaking of making a better world, history long ago let the cat out of the bag: it is only when people live with a reference higher than this world that they begin to be boons to their community, safe as a neighbor, and worthy to be entrusted with office.

Karl Barth's Letter on German Remilitarization

(The occasion for this letter was a criticism of Barth in Germany because he did not seem to apply the same standards in opposing Communism, which he applied when in 1938 he wrote a significant letter to Prof. Hromadka in Prague, asserting that opposition to Nazism was a service to Christ.)

You think it would be advisable if I stated expressly why I do not want the logic of my letter to Hromadka applied to the present East-West conflict; why I do not find the present situation analogous to that of 1938. One could put the question even more clearly: Why I do not write to my West-German friends today what now would apply to the Russians in the same way that my letter then applied to the Nazis? I shall try to give you my answer:

1. The Hromadka letter in 1938 was written in the days of the Munich settlement. It was sent to Prague where the decision was being reached, as to whether the world outside of Germany would tolerate German aggression. On the 30th of September in that year I wrote in my diary: "Catastrophe of European liberty in Munich." I stood alone with this interpretation. "Realism" meant in those days the acceptance of the situation created by Hitler. Thanksgiving services were held in all the churches, including those here in Switzerland, for the preservation of peace. Six months later Hitler had violated this infamous accord of Munich. A year later he was in Poland—and the other consequences followed. If the "Czech soldier" [of whom Barth spoke in the Hromadka letter] had stood and had not been betrayed by the West, the Russians would not now be standing at the Elbe. That is when the die was cast. That is when the East-West problem arose. And that is when Europe and Christendom slept. . . .

I do not know when and how and to whom I would now direct a similar letter. A situation in which everything depended upon a yes or no decision has not subsequently developed. The determination, whether

rightly or wrongly motivated, to resist Stalinist Communist aggression is the common policy of the West. Its intensification through a Christian word is superfluous. On the question no one sleeps today. On the contrary, one notes rather a nervousness, hysteria and fear which is not conducive to the highest form of determination. The Christian word today would have to be that we ought not be afraid. But such a word ought not be shouted. It can best be expressed in the way one lives and remains silent, particularly since so much is being said, both helpful and foolish. . . .

2. In the Hromadka letter I called, in the name of the Christian faith, for resistance to the armed threat and aggression of Hitler. I am no pacifist and would do the same today. The foe of Czech and European freedom proved in those days again and again that his force would have to be met by force. . . . The peace at any price which the world, and also the churches, sought at that time was neither human nor Christian. That is why I "shouted" at that time. . . .

The present Russia is not the peace loving nation it professes to be. It claims to be menaced particularly by the Anglo-Saxon powers. I cannot understand the reasons for this fear though I have tried to remain receptive to its arguments. It is obvious that Russia assumed a threatening attitude immediately after the conclusion of the war.

I must admit that if I were an American or British statesman I would not neglect preparations for a possible military defense. . . . But all this is being done in the West today without any specific Christian word or warning being necessary. . . . Today the Christian duty lies in another direction. Today we must continue to insist that war is identical with death in the sense that it is inevitable only when it has happened. In 1938 war was an actuality but could have been nipped in the bud with the right kind of determination. Russia has not created a similar situation today. It has not presented any one with an ultimatum or committed aggression. (I do not hold it responsible for Korea.) There is no evidence for, and much evidence against the idea that it wants war. There are still means of avoiding war. Until they are exhausted (as they were exhausted in 1938) no one in the West has the right to believe in the inevitability or the desirability of war or to meet Russia as Hitler had to be faced. We do not face the glorification of war and we must, therefore, express our resolution to oppose Communism without falling into fear and hatred or into war-like talk and action. A war which is not forced upon one, a war which is any other category but the *ultima ratio* of the political order, war as such is murder. . . . Every premature acceptance of war, all words, deeds and thoughts which assume that it is already present, help to produce it. For this reason it is important that there be people in all nations who refuse to participate in a holy crusade against Russia and Communism, however much they may be criticized for their stand.

Finally we cannot emphasize too strongly that the most important defense against Communism consists in extension of justice for all classes. In the event of war we must be prepared to face an army of millions of well equipped soldiers who will be convinced (from our

standpoint, wrongly) of the righteousness of their cause and who will be prepared to give everything in the battle against the "criminals" (they mean us). Could one say as much for the armies of the so-called free world? Mere hatred of Communism and Russia will not suffice us. The masses of our people must have experienced the value of our freedom in such a way that they would be willing to give their life for it. . . . Of course Communism might triumph without war if its worse values appeared better to the masses of the Western world than what we offer in the name of democracy. In France this seems to be the case. Whoever does not want Communism (and none of us do) had better seek for social justice than merely oppose it.

3. On the question which you put to me on the remilitarization of Germany: One must not confuse this question with the general problem of pacifism, nor with the general question of the defense of the West. It is not logically correct to demand that anyone who disavows pacifism and believes in the defense of the West should also favor German remilitarization. I will give you a few reasons why I regard this as a unique problem. . . .

In the first place, I do not have the temerity to ask the German people who have been bled white in two wars to make this sacrifice again. A normal survival impulse must persuade the German people to refrain from this sacrifice.

In the second place, I regard it as impossible to expect of the German people that they arm for a war which is bound to be a civil war for them, in which Germans will be arrayed against Germans.

Thirdly, it does not seem to me to be morally defensible to tell a nation which one has sought to demilitarize to the point of denying it the use of tin soldiers as children's toys, that its salvation now depends upon preparation for another war.

Fourthly, it seems clear to me that the remilitarization of western Germany might be the spark in the powder barrel with which the West, and Germany in particular, ought not to play.

In the fifth place, it is not at all clear to me how the Western strategists propose to defend Germany between the Elbe and the Rhine, which might mean that a German army is expected to sacrifice itself at the Pyrenees after leaving their families in Germany.

In the sixth place, I believe that the positive defense against Communism has a special significance for Germany. Has enough been done for the exiles, for the unemployed and the homeless and for the return of war prisoners that Communism might not be drawn into Germany as a sponge draws in water, despite the present rejection of it in western Germany?—As a German I would be inclined to say, we cannot do this for we are otherwise engaged.

Finally, I ask a question hesitantly because I will risk the ill-will of Germans: Would it not be bad policy to have a German army, with all that goes with a German army in the European situation? History has proved that if an Englishman or a Swiss puts on a uniform that is not the same as when a German puts one on. The German becomes a total soldier too easily and too quickly. In common with many Europeans I would

rather not see the re-emergence of the German soldier. And even if I were a German, and perhaps particularly if I were a German, I would rather not have his re-emergence, not even when the peril from the East is considered.

Memorandum

To the Editor:

I have read with interest Mr. Brown's attack on *CHRISTIAN ECONOMICS* covering nearly half of your paper, for November 27, 1950, and I would like your readers to know that they can secure copies of our comment thereon in *CHRISTIAN ECONOMICS*, for January 2, 1951, by writing to us: The Christian Freedom Foundation, Inc., 26 West 58th Street, New York 19, N. Y.

They will then gain a clear understanding of the principles for which this organization stands and the degree of accuracy with which Mr. Brown has interpreted them.

HOWARD E. KERSHNER,
Editor.

World Council Warns Against Over-Emphasis of Rearmament

A warning against excessive concern over rearmament was sounded by the executive committee of the World Council of Churches at sessions in Bievres near Paris attended by leading churchmen from the United States and other Western countries.

The committee's warning was embodied in a letter drafted as a guide to the World Council's 158 member Churches in 43 countries, in the present international crisis.

Declaring that rearmament has "become the main and general emphasis everywhere," the letter said that "its declared purpose is peace, but it can in reality endanger both peace, security and social justice."

"In these circumstances," the letter added, "it is an urgent Christian concern that armaments should not, no matter what their necessity, dominate the whole life of national and international society. It is the duty of all churches to champion peace with justice."

The letter appealed to Christians to "use every influence we can to press for the objective of bringing all national armaments under international control."

"Every effort," it said, "must be made to meet the basic challenge of totalitarian Communism by means other than war."

Stressing the need for social justice and the recognition of social revolution in the world, the letter warned that one of the greatest dangers of rearmament is that it will drain the vigor out of reconstruction.

"All peoples in privileged countries, particularly Christians," it declared, "must strive to enter sympathetically into the social demands of the needy. The churches have by no means neglected social action, but they have fallen short of what they should have done. The true ends of peace and social justice must be the constant concern of all Christian men and of all churches."

One of the leading speakers at the sessions was Methodist Bishop G. Bromley Oxnam of New York, a

Christianity and Crisis

A Bi-Weekly Journal of Christian Opinion
537 West 121st St., New York 27, N. Y.

EDITORIAL BOARD

REINHOLD NIEBUHR, *Chairman*

M. SEARLE BATES	F. ERNEST JOHNSON
JOHN C. BENNETT	LISTON POPE
HENRY SLOANE COFFIN	HENRY P. VAN DUSEN

GLOSTER MORRIS, *Secretary*

CONTRIBUTING EDITORS

JAMES C. BAKER	HENRY SMITH LEIPER
CHARLES W. GILKEY	JOHN A. MACKAY
LYNN HAROLD HOUGH	RHODA E. MCCULLOCH
UMPHREY LEE	FRANCIS P. MILLER
	EDWARD L. PARSONS
HOWARD CHANDLER ROBBINS	

co-president of the World Council, who said he had been struck by the "alarming" extent of Communism in Europe and the development of a "dangerous mood which borders on defeatism."

"The Church," he said, "has a fundamental duty by reason of its faith to teach nations and individuals how to face at all times and in all places the future unafraid. It is also the duty of Christians to apply ethical principles of religion so as to make war, and social injustice, which leads to it, impossible."

During his talk, Bishop Oxnam referred to frank discussions at the sessions which had brought out "the understandable but unfortunate" resentment of Europeans against having to receive economic aid from the United States.

"Our Christian friends," he said, "also emphasized that Hollywood movies are being used by Communists as anti-American propaganda to depict Americans as gangsters, over-sexed, and luxury mad."

"Hollywood has to learn," Bishop Oxnam said, "that it has a responsibility to the American people as well as to the box office."

Among the subjects discussed at the sessions were the necessity of convincing the Asiatic countries that the World Council is not a movement limited only to the countries of Western civilization, and the "enormous refugee problems" that exist throughout the world.

Dr. Robert C. Mackie, director of the World Council's refugee aid department, reported that 30,000 displaced persons had been helped to emigrate to the United States, and that a similar number would be aided in the coming six months. He said that member Churches were being asked to contribute an initial \$700,000 toward the 1951 resettlements.

A report also was presented by Dr. Franklin C. Fry of New York, president of the United Lutheran Church in America, who recently undertook a month's globe-circling tour to obtain an up-to-the-minute picture of relief needs for American Protestants. His report dealt mainly with refugee conditions in the Far East, especially in Korea.

The meeting agreed that the next great refugee problem to be tackled would be that of Arab refugees from Palestine. It was announced that a meeting would be held in Beirut, Lebanon, next May at which Christian churches in the Near East would be urged to meet their "moral responsibility" in regard to the problem.—*Religious News Service*.

Archbishop Germanos, Orthodox Ecumenical Leader, Dies

Archbishop Strenopoulis Germanos of Thyateira, Exarch of the Greek Orthodox Ecumenical Patriarchate for Western and Northern Europe, died in London at the age of 78.

An outstanding leader of the Greek Church, Archbishop Germanos was one of the six presidents of the World Council of Churches. He was a recipient of the Lambeth Cross, awarded by the Church of England for notable service in promoting understanding and closer relationships between Anglicans and Greek Orthodox communicants.—*Religious News Service*.

Mimeographed copies of the index for Volume X of *Christianity and Crisis* are now ready. Copies are being mailed to all libraries. Anyone else interested in receiving a copy should notify this office, 537 West 121st Street, New York 27, New York.

Detroit Public Library
Book Receiving
5201 Woodward
Detroit 2, Mich.

650 1-52

Authors in This Issue

Llofty Levonian is Dean and Professor of Old Testament and Islamics at the Near East School of Theology, Beirut, Lebanon. He is at present the visiting Professor of World Christianity at Union Theology Seminary, New York City.

Hugh Stevenson Tigner is minister of the Plainville Christian Church (Congregational), Plainville, New York.